



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/587,948 06/06/00 POLLACK

G GPP-01

EXAMINER

MMC2/1114

JOHN R. FLANAGAN
FLANAGAN & FLANAGAN
P O BOX 11300
JACKSON HOLE WY 83002

ETISHERDA E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED:

11/14/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/587,948

Applicant(s)

POLLACK, GEORGE P.

Examiner

Felix O. Figueroa

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 June 2000 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected because the label for the length "L" should be outside the body of the housing.

The centerline "L" of the plug housing is not labeled.

Specification

The specification is objected because reference character "L" has been used to designate both the length and a longitudinal centerline. See page 7 line 18 and page 8 line 7. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3, 11 and 16 recite piercing knives "in an end-to-end tandem alignment", however the piercing knives are not in an end-to-end arrangement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Govaerts (BE 0544048) in view of Bellinger (US 5,567,187).

Govaerts discloses a crimp flange (12) having a pair of upwardly flared side portions (11), insulation piercing knives tandem aligned and connected to the crimp flange, and a terminal connected to the crimp flange and extending for insertion into an external electrical socket. Govaerts discloses the claimed invention except for a round terminal instead of a blade. Bellinger shows that a blade is an equivalent structure known in the art for a terminal connector. Therefore, because these two terminal connectors were art-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious the substitution of the round terminals for the blade terminals to match the configuration of the preferred electrical socket.

Claims 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellinger in view of Govaerts.

Bellinger discloses a plug housing (20) having opposite ends and spaced apart channels, a pair of insulated conductors (36) and a pair of electrical terminals including a crimp flange and a blade connected to the crimp flange. However Bellinger does not disclose insulation piercing knives. Govaerts teaches the use of insulation piercing knives (8) to pierce the outer insulating cover of the conductor and complete the electrical connection. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use of insulation piercing knives on the crimp flange as taught by Govaerts to obtain a more secure electrical connection.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Bellinger shows the housing and the electrical terminal with a one-piece construction.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Bellinger shows the claimed structure in Figure 2.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Govaerts shows the pair of insulation piercing knives disposed in a tandem alignment with each other.

Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellinger and Govaerts as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Takemasa (US 6,045,408).

Neither Bellinger nor Govaerts disclose the use of undulations in a web portion. However, Takemasa teaches the use of a plurality of undulating barbs to secure fast the electrical terminal to the housing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a plurality of barbs as taught by Takemasa to a secure fastening of the electrical terminal to the housing.

Claims 13 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert (US 2,229,288) in view of Ozaki (JP 09-213436).

Gilbert does not provide a procedure for making a plug assembly. However, the structure showed by Gilbert suggests the method claimed (steps b, c, e and f) except for the provision of a strip to align the terminals (steps a and d). Ozaki discloses the use of a strip to align terminals. Therefore, it would have been obvious the use of a strip to hold and align the terminals to accelerate the manufacture of the assembly.

Regarding claims 18-20, the order between the crimping of the terminal and the remission of the strips would have been an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2833

skill in the art since the applicant has not disclose that the order between the two steps provide any advantage or solve any stated problem.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert and Ozaki as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Weimer (BE 0622734).

Weimer teaches the piercing knives being cutout and bent upwardly.

Claim 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert, Ozaki and Weimer as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Govaerts.

Govaerts teaches the use of a plurality of piercing knives and said knives are provided in a tandem alignment.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert, Ozaki and Weimer as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Takemasa.

Takemasa teaches the use of undulations on a web portion. However Takemasa does not disclose undulations on opposite sides of the web portion. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate undulations on opposite sides of the web portion, since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felix O. Figueroa whose telephone number is (703) 308-0097. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:00-5:00.


Art Unit: 2833

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

ffr

November 8, 2000


RENEE LUEBKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER